

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated July 19, 2005 has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 1, 13, 21 and 36 have been amended for formalities. Entry of the amendments to the claims is respectfully requested. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is also respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

I. THE INDEFINITENESS REJECTION OF CLAIM 1

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Responsive to this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 to correct the error of insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 13, 21 and 36 have also been amended to correct similar errors.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned indefiniteness rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

II. THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-44

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 17-18, 20-26, 29, 31-37 and 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,464) in view of Phaal (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,269). On page 8 of the Final Office Action, claims 5-6, 15-16 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges in view of Phaal and further in view of Devine (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0041263). On page 9 of the Final Office Action, claims 9-10, 19, 30 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges in view of Phaal and further in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 4,788,715). On page 11 of the Final Office Action, claims 27, 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges in view of Phaal and further in view of Bhoj (U.S. Patent No. 6,742,016). These rejections are hereby respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that Grantges and Phaal, in combination, teach the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 13, 21 and 36. This assertion is incorrect for at least the following reasons: (1) the cited references do not contemplate an internet customer access system that is independent from the web site to be accessed; and (2) the cited references do not teach or suggest "receiving a

redirected access request for access to a web site from a name server."

First, the internet customer access system, as recited in the amended claims 1, 13, 21 and 36, is not a traditional gateway system which is typically a part of a web site that a customer attempts to access. As recited in claims 1, 13, 21 and 36, the internet customer access system is "independent from the web site." An exemplary illustration may be found in Figure 1 of the present application, wherein the internet customer access system is embodied as a Traffic Regulating System 100 which is independent from the E-commerce site 200. In other words, the Traffic Regulating System 100 is not implemented as a gateway or otherwise an integral part of the E-commerce site 200. If the Traffic Regulating System 100 were a gateway entrance to the E-commerce site 200, the path 6 (i.e., internet connection between the Customer System 400 and the E-commerce site 200) in Figure 1 would have to pass through the Traffic Regulating System 100 in all circumstances. However, in Figure 1, an internet connection is illustrated as being maintained without passing through the Traffic Regulating System 100.

In contrast, Grantges and Phaal only contemplate that their access systems act as physical entry points that are part of their respective web sites. For example, the Grantges system is

called an "Application Gateway 38" and is disposed between web servers (e.g., 28₁, 28₂, 28₃) and a firewall 32. Grantges: Figure 1. See also, Grantges, Figures 2 and 7. Since security is its primary concern, Grantges would not have implemented its Application Gateway without shielding it behind a firewall. Therefore, Grantges is clearly limited to implementing its gateway as part of the web site to be accessed.

The same is true with Phaal, which refers to its system as an "Admission Control Gateway 25." See, Phaal: Figure 1. According to Phaal, its admission control system is "resident on a server" and is most typically implemented in software on "a server which has processing resources which are sometimes strained." Phaal: col. 4, lines 36-42. "A server which has processing resources which are sometimes strained" is apparently a web-hosting server which is being access-controlled. Thus, this statement indicates that Phaal's admission control system is implemented as part of, not independent from, the web site to be accessed.

Therefore, neither Grantges nor Phaal contemplate an internet customer access system that is independent from the web site, as presently claimed.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner points to the following passage as proof that Grantges discloses an internet customer access system independent from a web site:

"Applications 24₁, 24₂, ... , 24₃, particularly programs 30₁, 30₂, ... , 30₃ thereof, exist independently of computer system 20. That is, no modifications to programs 30₁, 30₂, ... , 30₃, are required for use with computer system 20. For example, applications 24₁, 24₂, ... , 24₃, may involve Carrier Access Billing, Subscription Services (e.g., long distance carriers), and the like. Destination servers 28₁, 28₂, ... , 28₃, are preferably compatible with the ubiquitous HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP 1.1), which is employed over connections 58, 60, and 62. Destination servers 28₁, 28₂, ... , 28₃ interface computer system 20 with respective programs 30₁, 30₂, ... , 30₃. In effect, remote user 18 provides the web browser, and the application being accorded secure access provides the destination server. Computer system 20 provides the remainder of the needed connectivity and security."
Grantges: col. 5, lines 24-39.

It is respectfully submitted that the quoted passage does not teach or suggest that "the internet customer access system is independent from the web site" as presently claimed. The above-quoted passage refers to Figure 1 of the Grantges reference, wherein the computer system 20 is a secure gateway for user authentication. All user-originated hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) requests must go through the computer system 20 in order to reach the web servers 28₁, 28₂, ... , 28₃. In order to function behind a firewall provided by the computer system 20, these web servers typically have to be configured with the IP

address(es) associated with the computer system 20, such that HTTP requests directed at the web servers may be intercepted and processed by the computer system 20. Therefore, despite its physical independence from the web servers, the computer system 20 is actually part of a web site hosted by the web servers. As such, the computer system 20 is not independent from the web site.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner may have confused the terms "web server" and "web site." A web server is a device that holds web content or runs web programs, while a web site, as used herein, typically includes one or more such web servers as well as an access gateway which blocks users' direct access to the web servers. Within a web site, there may be devices, such as web servers and firewalls, that are physically independent from one another. However, these devices are not independent from the web site because they are considered part of the web site.

Second, neither Grantges nor Phaal teach or suggest "receiving a redirected customer request for access to a web site from a name server" as recited in the amended claims 1, 13, 21 and 36. Referring to Figure 1 as an example, "when the customer system 400 attempts to access the web site 200 and connects to the name server 300 as shown by path 2, the name

server 300 directs the request to the traffic regulating system 100 instead of the actual web site 200 as shown by path 3." Page 10, lines 17-21. That is, a customer's web site access request is redirected from a name server to an internet customer access system, without routing the access request first to the requested web site. The routing of the access request is an "redirection" because the access request was intended for the web site, not for the internet customer access system which is a network entity independent from the requested web site.

In Grantges and Phaal, however, there is no such "redirection" of messages. In both systems, the gateway system is disposed as a physical entry point to the requested web-hosting network and is practically part of the requested web site. All requests for accessing the web site are in fact addressed to the corresponding gateway system. No "redirection" of access requests occurs in Grantges or Phaal because the requests will flow via the gateway system towards the web servers without being diverted elsewhere.

The Examiner asserts that the Gateway 38 in Grantges performs the claimed redirect receiving function by receiving request from Proxy Server 34. See, Grantges: Figure 1 and col. 4, lines 49-52. However, the forwarding of messages from the Proxy Server 34 to the Gateway 38 is not a "redirection" in the

same sense as claimed in the present application. In addition, the Proxy Server 34 is not a "name server."

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner cites Figure 8 and the following passages from Grantges as disclosing the claimed "redirection":

"Gateway proxy server 40 further performs well-known mapping functions, and, in accordance with the present invention, efficiently routes messages destined for various applications 24₁, 24₂, ... , 24₃ to the appropriate one of the destination servers 28₁, 28₂, ... , 28₃. Gateway proxy server 40 may comprise conventional apparatus known to those of ordinary skill in the art, such as, for example, Netscape proxy server software running on conventional hardware.

Gateway proxy server 40 is further configured to establish third secure connection 56 within gateway 38 with web server 44. Connection 56 may be established as described above with respect to secure connection 54." Grantges: col. 7, lines 1-12.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Figure 8 nor the cited passages disclose "receiving a redirected customer request for access to a web site from a name server" as presently claimed. The citation merely shows the internal mapping of request messages to different web applications within a web site, but does not disclose an external redirection of an access request to an access system independent from the web site.

In addition, the redirection of access requests should be viewed in the context of the claimed invention wherein the

access requests are intended for a customer web site, but are redirected from a name server to an internet customer access system independent from the customer web site. None of the cited references, individually or in combination, discloses redirection in such a situation as presently claimed.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Grantges and Phaal fail to teach or suggest all of the elements recited in independent claims 1, 13, 21 and 36. Therefore, the Office Action has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned obviousness rejection of claims 1-44 be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams LLP

By: 

Thomas E. Anderson

Registration No. 37,063

TEA/

Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
Telephone: (202) 955-1500
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

Date: January 13, 2006